

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/709,259		04/24/2004	Joan Carreras	04278	3258	
23688	7590	05/16/2006		EXAMINER		
Bruce E. Harang				HOFFBERG, RC	HOFFBERG, ROBERT JOSEPH	
PO BOX 872735 VANCOUVER, WA 98687-2735				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2835		
				DATE MAILED: 05/16/200	DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	¥-
Office Action Summary		10/709,259	CARRERAS, JOAN	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Robert J. Hoffberg	2835	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA ISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communitory period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute the period by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 A This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowa	action is non-final.	prosecution as to the merits	is
3)	closed in accordance with the practice under E			.0
		,		
·	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawing claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) is/are subject to restriction and/or and/or are subject.			
Applicati	ion Papers			
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 April 2006</u> is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2015.	igstyle igy igstyle igy igstyle igy igstyle igy igy igstyle igy igstyle igy igy igy igy igy igy igy igy	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Application from the International Bureation See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applic prity documents have been rece tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No vived in this National Stage	
2) Notice 3) Information	ot(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:		

Art Unit: 2835

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Regarding claim 1, the phrase "or the like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson (US 5,906,514) in view of Fouts et al. (US 5,179,503).

With respect to Claim 1, Nelson teaches a fuse holder system suitable for mounting in an automobile main electrical junction box (Fig. 2, #10) and further suitable for mounting fuses involved in periodic controls or diagnoses of vehicle safety systems, including ABS, airbags, brake control and the like comprising: a fuse holder module body (1) (fig. 2, #24) capable of housing a plurality of fuses (3) and (5) (Fig. 3, #14) having different configurations; said fuses (3) and (5) capable of being connected and disconnected (Col, 3, line 24, removeable, examiner is interpreting that the fuses as part

Art Unit: 2835

of fuse holder module body are capable of being connected and disconnected from the junction box) at will; said fuse holder module body (1) having two housings (2) and (4) (Col. 4, lines 11-12 and Fig. 3, #12 (not shown) for #14 on left and right sides) for said fuses (3) and (5), and a cover (7) (Fig. 2, #37) for closure of said housings (2) and (4); and further having a fixing element (10) (Fig. 2, #36) fixing said fuse holder module body (1) to said automobile main electric junction box. Nelson fails to teach fuses having different configurations. Fouts et al. teaches fuses having different configurations (Fig. 3, FUSE and MAXI-FUSE) in a module body (Fig. 1, #12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Nelson with that of Fouts et al. for the purpose of combining different configurations of fuses to maximize protection of the electrical components.

With respect to Claim 2, Nelson in view of Fouts et al. teach a fuse holder system of claim 1 above. Nelson further teaches that the number of fuses are variable in number (Col. 3, line 47). While Nelson fails to teach that said housings (2) and (4) being variable in number and configuration, according to the number and configurations of fuses (3) and (5), it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that each fuse would need a housing (#12) to electrically and mechanically connect to the system. It has been held that changes in configuration (sizes) or number (duplication of parts) are obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention. In re Rose, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955) and *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 2835

was made to modify the system of Nelson in view of Fouts et al. for the purpose of combining different configurations of fuses to maximize protection of the electrical components.

With respect to Claim 3, Nelson further teaches that said cover (7) (Fig. 3, #37) for covering said housings (2) and (4) of said fuse holder module body (1) forms a single piece (see Fig. 3) therewith, and is joined therewith through a pivoting line (Col. 3, line 67, hinged) determining a joint or a swinging hinge (8) (fig. 3, not marked), said cover (7) being provided with fixing means (9) (Fig. 4, #26) for fixing it to said fuse holder module (1) in a closed position (see Fig. 4).

With respect to Claim 4, Nelson further teaches that said cover (7) (Fig. 3, #37) for covering said housings (2) and (4) of said fuse holder module body (1) being joined together by a pivoting line (Col. 3, line 67, hinged) determining a joint or a swinging hinge (8) (fig. 3, not marked), said cover (7) further being provided with fixing means (9) (Fig. 4, #26) for fixing said cover to said fuse holder module body (1) in a closed position (see Fig. 4).

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 4/29/06, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 have been fully considered and are persuasive based upon applicant's amended claims. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made above.
- 4. Applicant argues that Nelson does not teach a fuse block suitable for easy and convenient removal of fuses. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Clearly the fuse

Art Unit: 2835

block is suitable for removal as shown in Figures 1 and 2. Furthermore, the claim requires fuses involved in systems including...brake controls and the like. This language is broad and the fuses of Nelson meet this limitation. Security of the fuse block does not prevent the system from being easy and convenient for removal as these are relative terms. Statements in the preamble reciting the purpose or intended use of the claimed invention must be evaluated to determine whether the recited purpose or intended use results in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art. MPEP 2111.02 (II).

- 5. With respect to applicant's comments regarding the different fuse types, it is noted that a secondary reference of Fouts has been added to meet this limitation.
- 6. Amendments to the drawing and the specification are acceptable and objection to the drawings is withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 10/709,259

Art Unit: 2835

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert J. Hoffberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-2761. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 4:30 PM Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RJH EZILL

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800